## SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA MARICOPA COUNTY

FN 2012-092431 09/25/2015

HONORABLE THEODORE CAMPAGNOLO

CLERK OF THE COURT
K. Rodriguez
Deputy

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF JACQUELINE R CARROLL

**ERIK C BERGSTROM** 

AND

ALEXANDER MICHAEL CARROLL

STANLEY D MURRAY

## MINUTE ENTRY

Prior to the commencement of today's proceedings, Petitioner's Exhibits 1 through 5 and Respondent's exhibit 6 is marked for identification.

Courtroom SEF 301

2:32 p.m. This is the time set for the Evidentiary Hearing regarding Respondent's Motion to Stay and for Determination of Supersedeas Bond. Counsel, Erik Bergstrom, is present on behalf of Petitioner/Mother, Jacqueline Carroll, who is present. Counsel, Stanley Murray, is present on behalf of Respondent/Father, Alexander Michael Carroll, who is present.

A record of the proceedings is made by audio and/or videotape in lieu of a court reporter.

Jacqueline Carroll and Alexander Michael Carroll are sworn.

Alexander Michael Carroll testifies.

Petitioner's Exhibits 1 through 5 and Respondent's exhibit 6 are received into evidence.

Docket Code 005 Form D000C Page 1

## SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA MARICOPA COUNTY

FN 2012-092431 09/25/2015

THE COURT FINDS that it admitted all 6 exhibits, however, to make a determination under Rule 7, the Court finds that exhibit 6 is the only document that may be relevant. The Court finds that pursuant to Rule 7, the Court must set the lowest bond based on either the total amount of damages awarded, 50% of Respondent's net worth or 25 million dollars. Respondent has not proven his net worth by a preponderance of the evidence as required by Rule 7(a)(4) of the Arizona Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure. The Court finds that exhibit 6 is self-serving, it was made by Respondent and has not been vetted by any accountant, CPA or other financial professional that can provide the Court with a verifiable and accurate net worth. The Court further finds that Respondent did not prove by clear and convincing evidence as required by Rule 7(a)(5)(B) of the Arizona Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, that a bond in the amount of the judgment will cause substantial economic harm to Respondent.

**THE COURT FURTHER FINDS** that the amount of damage awarded is \$40,046.50.

**IT IS ORDERED** that a Stay shall be granted if the Respondent posts a bond in the amount of \$40,046.50.

3:19 p.m. Matter concludes.

All parties representing themselves must keep the Court updated with address changes. A form may be downloaded at: http://www.superiorcourt.maricopa.gov/SuperiorCourt/Self-ServiceCenter.